

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Michael Brauch and  
Andrew Meimes  
(N.D. Cal. Case No. C:05-2743 (BZ))  
(Additional Counsel are listed on Signature Page)

DAVID E. LIPTON, et al., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. C:05-2669 (MHP)
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO</b>
vs.	)	<b>CONSIDER WHETHER CASES</b>
	)	<b>SHOULD BE RELATED</b>
	)	
INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(b), plaintiffs Michael Brauch and Andrew Meimes, the plaintiffs in *Brauch v. Intel Corp.*, No. C:05-2743 (BZ) (N.D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005) (“*Brauch*”) hereby notify the Court and all counsel of their belief that the following are “related cases” within the meaning of Local Rule 3-12(a): (1) *Brauch*; (2) *Konieczka v. Intel Corp.*, No. C:05-2700 (MHP) (N.D. Cal., filed June 30, 2005) (“*Konieczka*”); (3) *Prohias v. Intel Corp.*, No. C:05-2699 (JL) (N.D. Cal., filed June 30, 2005) (“*Prohias*”); (4) *Niehaus v. Intel Corp.*, No. C:05-2720 (JCS) (N.D. Cal., filed July 1, 2005) (“*Niehaus*”); (5) *Hamilton v. Intel Corp.*, No. C:05-2721 (JCS) (N.D. Cal., filed July 1, 2005) (“*Hamilton*”); (6) *Baxley v. Intel Corp.*, No. C:05-2758 (EMC) (N.D. Cal., filed July 6, 2005) (“*Baxley*”); and (7) *Lipton v. Intel Corp.*, No. C:05-2669 (MHP) (N.D. Cal., filed June 29, 2005) (“*Lipton*”).

This administrative motion is made on the grounds that the plaintiffs in *Konieczka, Prohias, Nichaus, Baxley, Hamilton, Lipton* and *Brauch* filed substantially similar

1 class action complaints against the same defendant, Intel Corporation (“Intel”) and allege  
2 essentially the same antitrust conduct. Relating these seven cases pursuant to Local Rule 3-12  
3 will advance the convenience of the parties, witnesses and counsel, will avoid the risk of  
4 duplicative or inconsistent rulings, orders and judgments and will serve the interests of justice.<sup>1</sup>

5 Based on the foregoing, the undersigned respectfully submit that the assignment  
6 of these actions to a single judge will conserve judicial resources and promote an efficient  
7 determination of the actions. A proposed form of order accompanies this motion.

8 Dated: July 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

9 By: /s/ Michael P. Lehmann

10 Michael P. Lehmann

11 Thomas P. Dove

Alex C. Turan

The Furth Firm, LLP

225 Bush Street, 15th Floor

San Francisco, California 94104-4249

Telephone: (415) 433-2070

Facsimile: (415) 982-2076

15 Francis O. Scarpulla (41059)

Law Offices Of Francis O. Scarpulla

44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400

San Francisco, CA 94104

Telephone: (415) 788-7210

Facsimile: (415) 788-0707

19 Craig C. Corbitt (83251)

Zelle Hofmann Voelbel Mason & Gette, LLP

44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400

San Francisco, CA 94104

Telephone: (415) 693-0700

Facsimile: (415) 693-0770

23 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Michael Brauch and

Andrew Meimes

(N.D. Cal. Case No. C:05-2743 (BZ))

27 <sup>1</sup> The undersigned counsel has communicated with Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP, one of  
28 the counsel for plaintiffs in these other cases and it does not oppose treating them as related  
cases. No counsel has yet made an appearance for Intel in any of these cases, so its  
concurrence has not been obtained.